United Nations A/56/956

General Assembly

Distr.: General
8 July 2002

Original: English

Fifty-sixth session
Agenda items 126 and 130

Human resources management

Report of the Secretary-General on the activities of the Office of Internal Oversight Services

Possible discrimination due to nationality, race, sex, religion and language in recruitment, promotion and placement

Note by the Secretary-General*

1. Pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 48/218 B of 29 July 1994, 54/244 of 23 December 1999 and 55/258 of 27 June 2001, the Secretary-General has the honour to transmit, for the attention of the General Assembly, the attached report, conveyed to him by the Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services, on the inspection of possible discrimination due to nationality, race, sex, religion and language in recruitment, promotion and placement.

2. The Secretary-General takes note of the findings of the Office of Internal Oversight Services and concurs with its recommendations. The Secretary-General is committed to ensuring that discrimination is not tolerated in the Organization and that any such allegations will be promptly addressed. The Secretary-General has appointed an Ombudsman who will work to facilitate conflict resolution, including allegations of discrimination.

* The present report was delayed due to the complex information-gathering and extensive consultations involved.

02-39480 (E) 140802

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on possible discrimination due to nationality, race, sex, religion and language in recruitment, promotion and placement

Summary

In its resolution 55/258 of 14 June 2001, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to conduct an inspection through the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the issue of possible discrimination due to nationality, race, sex, religion and language in recruitment, promotion and placement, and to report thereon to the General Assembly at its fifty-sixth session.

In response to that request, an inspection team was formed in the Office of Internal Oversight Services and began its work in September 2001. Extensive data was collected on all segments of the staff population at Headquarters and at offices away from Headquarters on recruitment, placement and promotion during the time period 1996-2001.

The inspection team focused on (a) analysing the data from a regional and gender perspective to ascertain whether it demonstrated the presence of systematic and consistent patterns; (b) reviewing the current and proposed procedures for recruitment, placement and promotion to ensure that they guaranteed fairness and objectivity in the process; and (c) examining the control mechanisms currently in place to handle complaints of alleged discrimination in the Organization to determine their effectiveness.

The Office of Internal Oversight Services found shortcomings in the consistency, completeness and accessibility of data that is essential for this type of review. Nevertheless, most departments and offices made every effort to assist the Office of Internal Oversight Services by responding to its requests. The results of the analysis did not reveal a systematic and consistent pattern of preference or exclusion that impaired equal opportunity in recruitment, placement or promotion for any given region over the past six years. However, in some instances, regional differences do exist. For some grades, for some years and in some locations, appointment, promotion and reappointment rates vary among regions. The results of the analysis by gender indicate that disparities continue to exist at the higher grades. Men are more likely than women to be recruited, promoted and reappointed at the P-4 to D-2 levels. More attention needs to be given to recruiting and promoting women at the higher levels and to counteract the rising separation rate of women from the Organization.

The recruitment, placement and promotion system is the target of a major reform effort spearheaded by the Office of Human Resources Management. The Office of Internal Oversight Services believes that the new staff selection system could represent a significant improvement over the current system which is labour-intensive and perceived to be lacking in fairness and objectivity. The degree to which this improvement is achieved depends heavily on the accountability of managers for the decisions they make regarding recruitment, placement, mobility and promotion. "Galaxy", a web-based tool for the new staff selection system will help to enhance transparency and monitoring. Ongoing and strict monitoring of the new system and future development of supporting tools and training programmes by the Office of Human Resources Management is critical to its success.

The three complaint mechanisms for handling cases of discrimination, the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances, the Joint Appeals Board and the United Nations Administrative Tribunal, need to be strengthened. The Ombudsman function recently approved by the General Assembly should be integrated with the existing mechanisms to form a strong framework for addressing complaints of discrimination. From its review of complaint procedures in selected national Governments and other international organizations, the Office of Internal Oversight Services learned that efforts put on early dispute resolution reap benefits in terms of staff morale and economy of resources.

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Introduction	1–2	5
II.	Objectives	3	5
III.	Scope	4–6	5
IV.	Methodology	7–8	6
V.	Findings	9–89	7
	A. Analysis of data	9–45	7
	1. Trend analysis of the composition of the Secretariat	9–17	7
	2. Application, screening and selection	18–21	10
	3. Initial appointments, promotion and reappointments	22–40	11
	4. General Service to Professional and national competitive examinations	41–42	17
	5. The International Tribunals	43–45	18
	B. Control environment	46–56	18
	1. Recruitment, placement and promotion process	47–53	19
	2. Accountability of managers	54–56	20
	C. Complaint mechanisms	57–89	21
	1. Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances	58–62	21
	2. United Nations Administrative Tribunal	63–71	23
	3. Staff Council survey	72–77	25
	4. Comparison with other entities	78–89	26
VI.	Conclusions	90–95	29
VII.	Recommendations	96–108	30
Annexes			
I.	Countries within regions		33
II.	Initial appointments by grade and region, 1996-2001		36
III.	Initial appointments at different steps by region, 1996-2001		37
IV.	Promotions by grade and regions, 1996-2001		38
V.	Promotions at different steps by region, 1996-2001		39
VI.	Reappointment by grade and region, 1996-2001		40
VII.	Appointments, promotions and reappointments at locations by region, 1996-2001		41

I. Introduction

1. In its resolution 55/258 of 27 June 2001, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to conduct an inspection through the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the issue of possible discrimination due to nationality, race, sex, religion and language in recruitment, promotion and placement and report thereon to the General Assembly at its fifty-sixth session.

2. In July 1998, a Joint Advisory Committee working group was formed to look into the issue of racial discrimination as mandated by the General Assembly in its resolution 53/221 of 7 April 1999. However, as indicated in the report of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat (A/55/427, para. 65) the working group found it impossible to make any observations supported by evidence as the Secretariat does not record the "race" of individual staff members.

II. Objectives

3. The objectives of the inspection were to determine whether:

(a) Trends and indicators point to the presence of systematic discrimination based on regional groupings, gender or language in the recruitment, placement or promotion process in the Organization;

(b) The Organization's rules, regulations, policies and procedures are effective in preventing discrimination based on nationality, gender or language;

(c) The Organization's mechanisms for handling complaints of alleged discrimination are effective and transparent.

III. Scope

4. The mandate given to the Office of Internal Oversight Services was to look at possible discrimination based on race, nationality, sex, religion and language. Staff members are routinely asked in the application process to indicate their nationality, sex and mother tongue, for valid reasons. However, they are not asked for information regarding race or religion, as it could be discriminatory to do so. Moreover, the large number of nationalities represented in the United Nations makes it difficult to draw conclusions from disaggregated data on the basis of nationality alone. Therefore, the inspection examined possible discrimination based on nationality under the umbrella of regional groupings, gender and language. The regional groupings used were those applied by the Appointment and Promotion Board to the statistics it keeps on cases presented to it (see annex I).

5. The inspection covered the staff of the United Nations Secretariat (New York, Geneva, Nairobi and Vienna), including entities serviced by their appointment and promotion bodies, the regional commissions, peacekeeping missions and the International Tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. The aim of the inspection was to assess as wide a population as possible, since discrimination would not be limited to those staff occupying posts subject to geographical distribution or even to those staff holding appointments of one year or more, but could extend to the entire staff population at all levels.

6. The inspection examined:

(a) Reports of the Secretary-General on the Composition of the Secretariat[1] and Improvement in the Status of Women;[2]

(b) Information supplied by the Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women;

(c) The Organization's applicant database (TREX) from its inception in 2000 to October 2001;

(d) The Integrated Management Information System (IMIS), from January 1996 to October 2001, on all appointments, promotions and reappointments and information on mother tongue for all current staff on appointments of one year or more;

(e) Appointments and promotions from the Headquarters Appointment and Promotion Board and those bodies at offices away from Headquarters, including the regional commissions and the International Tribunals;

(f) Appointments resulting from the national competitive examinations from January 2000 to October 2001 and recruitments from the "G to P" examinations from 1997 to 2000;

(g) Current and proposed appointment, placement and promotion policies and procedures;

(h) Appointment and promotion circulars on exceptions and waivers from 1998 to 2001;

(i) Human resources departmental action plans from 1999 to 2001;

(j) Terms of reference for and reports of the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances since its inception to the present;

(k) Selected cases submitted to the Joint Appeals Board, the United Nations Administrative Tribunal and the Office of Internal Oversight Services;

(l) Complaint processes in national Governments, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank.

IV. Methodology

7. The A definition of discrimination used is set out below and was based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Equality Conventions of the International Labour Organization (ILO).

> *Discrimination is defined as any distinction, restriction, exclusion or preference based on race, sex, religion, nationality or language which has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment in recruitment, placement or promotion.*

8. The Office of Internal Oversight Services interviewed senior management of the Office of Human Resources Management, members of the Staff Committee, those responsible for the mechanisms that are part of the administration of justice

(Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances, Joint Appeals Board, United Nations Administrative Tribunal), Human Rights, the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Gender Issues, the Focal Point for Women, the Group on Equal Rights for Women, members of the Joint Advisory Committee Working Group and the appointment and promotion bodies. Several delegates to the Fifth Committee representing various nationalities and regions were also interviewed to provide insight into the genesis of the request for the report and any specific concerns that needed to be addressed.

V. Findings

A. Analysis of data

1. Trend analysis of the composition of the Secretariat

9. Staff on posts subject to geographical distribution represents an average of 17 per cent of the total posts in the United Nations Secretariat[3] in the period from 1997 to 2001.

Figure 1



10. Over the five-year period, posts subject to geographical distribution dropped from 2,461 to 2,445 for a net decrease of 16 posts, although posts in the Secretariat as a whole showed a net increase of 738 posts (from 14,136 to 14,874). Extrabudgetary posts have also shown increases in all categories, with the Professional category increasing by 1,065 posts and the General Service category by 600 posts in the last year.

Table 1

	Regular budget (RB) resources				*Extrabudgetary (XB) resources*			
Year	*Professional posts*	*Project posts*	*General Service posts*	*Total RB posts*	*Professional posts*	*Project posts*	*General Service posts*	*Total XB posts*
1997	3 140	78	5 387	8 605	1 077	680	3 774	5 531
1998	2 921	65	4 817	7 803	1 243	669	3 828	5 740
1999	2 861	42	4 519	7 394	1 443	745	4 737	6 925
2000	2 975	16	4 529	7 470	1 465	781	3 448	5 694
2001	2 978	25	4 482	7 485	2 530	811	4 048	7 389

11. On average, recruitment for posts subject to geographical distribution accounted for 4 per cent of the total annual recruitment. Recruitment for both geographic and non-geographic posts shows an increasing trend. Non-geographic recruitment, however, shows a greater increase between 1999 and 2001 than does geographic recruitment, owing to staffing increases in peacekeeping missions, as shown in table 2.

Table 2

	Recruitment into the United Nations Secretariat		
		For posts subject to geographical distribution	
Year	*Total*	*Number*	*Percentage*
1997	1 954	93	5
1998	2 425	104	4
1999	2 424	123	5
2000	3 555	141	4
2001	4 925	159	3

12. For staff on contracts of one year or more, the trend in the recruitment of women is increasing, from 42 per cent in 1998, to 47 per cent in 2001. However, there has been an increase in the proportion of women separating from the Organization, from 42 per cent in 1998, to 48 per cent in 2001. The recruitment trend for women does not even match the separation trend, which indicates that the Organization is unlikely to meet its gender parity target without concentrated efforts to recruit females and retain the female staff currently employed. Efforts should be made to determine the reasons for the rising number of women separating from the Organization.

13. The promotion index, which is the ratio between the number of promotions and the total number of staff, has shown an increasing trend over the past five years. This suggests that the Organization is increasingly promoting staff from within, rather than recruiting from external sources. While this trend is positive, the index will need to increase sharply to keep pace with the forecasted number of retirements over the next few years.

14. After significant increases in the number of promotions between 1998 and 2000, the number has levelled off. Figure 2 depicts this trend.

Figure 2



15. Between 1987 and 2001, the percentage of women at the Professional level and above, in posts subject to geographical distribution, grew at an average rate of 1 per cent per year, rising to 40.4 per cent in 2001. This trend is shown in figure 3.

Figure 3



16. Data was available for a wider population, covering posts of one year or more, from 1998 to 2001. This data showed small gains for women at the Professional levels and above from 1998 to 2000, but a subsequent decline of about 2 per cent in 2001, bringing the level slightly below that of 1998, as depicted in figure 4. In the wider population, in 2001, staff on posts with duration of one year or more achieved gender parity in six programmes, although three have a small number of staff and six others have not yet achieved 30 per cent female representation.

Figure 4



17. In the Secretariat, 10 departments selected 50 per cent or more women to fill their vacant posts in 2000. This number grew to 14 departments that met the gender balance goal of selecting women in 2001. The data for all departments in the Secretariat shows that there has been improvement between 2000 and 2001 in striving for gender parity in selection at the P-2 and P-3 levels and, to a lesser extent, at the P-4 level. However at the P-5 and D-1 levels, more efforts are still required in all departments.

2. Application, screening and selection

18. Since 2000, all applications in response to vacancy announcements have been captured in an electronic database. The Staffing Support Section then screens the applicants and determines which applications are eligible for forwarding to the Programme Manager, based on the criteria in the vacancy announcement, required seniority (for internal candidates) and geographic representation (for external candidates). The Office of Internal Oversight Services selected a random sample of 50 vacancy announcements from the total of 655 in the database. Since the database is not updated to include either the letters prepared by the Office of Human Resources Management indicating the applicants who were forwarded to the departments or offices, or the final selected candidates, this information was gathered manually for the vacancy announcements in the sample. Owing to time constraints, only 44 letters indicating the applications that were forwarded to departments or offices were located. Of those, only 29 resulted in a selected candidate; 12 were subject to recirculation, 2 were filled by lateral transfer and 1 was part of a general recruitment campaign. For this reason, it was not possible to utilize the data on the final candidate selected for comparative purposes. Table 3 below summarizes the number and percentage of applicants from each region and the number and percentage of applications that were forwarded to programme managers.

Table 3

Region	Applicants		Applicants forwarded	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage of applicants
Africa	909	29	190	21
Asia and the Pacific	596	19	112	19
Europe (Eastern)	151	5	34	23
Europe (Western)	472	15	116	25
Latin America	178	6	18	10
Middle East	112	4	11	10
North America and the Caribbean	422	13	92	22
Others	12	<1	2	17
Unknown	291	9	34	12
Total	**3 143**	**100**	**710**	

19. About 11 per cent of the applicants in the database had no indicated nationality. This was particularly the case for internal candidates where nationality is not a criteria for selection. The Office of Internal Oversight Services manually examined these cases to determine, where possible, the applicant's region, reducing the number of applicants with an unknown nationality to 9 per cent.

20. For the sample selected, an average for all regions of 17 per cent of the applicants received were forwarded to programme managers. Of these, 5 per cent were internal candidates and 12 per cent were external candidates. Because of the large population under review, it was not feasible to determine the validity of the criteria used to forward the applications of candidates for further evaluation by programme managers. A lower than average number of applications from candidates from Latin America and the Middle East were forwarded to programme managers. The highest rate for forwarding internal candidates was for the Eastern European region (12 per cent), while the highest rates for forwarding external candidates were for the African (18 per cent), Western European (18 per cent), North American and Caribbean (17 per cent) and other (17 per cent) regions.

21. As part of its reform programme, the Office of Human Resources Management is in the process of developing a web-based tool commonly referred to as "Galaxy" to support the new staff selection system in the Secretariat that will also incorporate the functionality of the TREX application system.

3. Initial appointments, promotions and reappointments

22. The IMIS database of all initial appointments, promotions and reappointments for the six-year time period (1996-2001) contained 32,164 records associated with 18,721 individuals.[4] These actions covered all categories of posts and staff in the United Nations Secretariat. A separate analysis was done for each of the three

categories: initial appointment, promotion and reappointment.[5] Table 4 illustrates the breakdown of initial appointments in this database by region and gender.

Table 4

Initial appointments, by region and gender, 1996-2001

Total appointments: 11,459 (11,267 individuals) (percentage)	
Western Europe	29
Africa	18
Asia and the Pacific	15
North America and the Caribbean	14
Latin America	9
Eastern Europe	8
Middle East	6
Others	1
Male 59	
Female 41	

23. Further analysis was performed to illustrate initial appointment by grade and region. Based on the data, the Office of Internal Oversight Services established the average proportion of initial appointments at each grade and the proportion for each region at each grade. After taking into account a deviation of plus or minus 0.5 per cent, the data showed that the staff in the African, Latin American and Middle Eastern regions registered a higher proportion of initial appointments at the General Service level, while staff from the Asia and Pacific region showed a higher proportion of initial appointments at the Professional level. The latter was also true for staff of the North American and Caribbean region (with the exception of P-1 and P-5). Staff from the Western European region showed a higher proportion of initial appointments at the P-1, P-2, P-5 and D-1 levels. A table showing the full range of initial appointments by grade within each region can be found in annex II.

24. The Office of Internal Oversight Services selected the P-3, P-4 and P-5 levels for analysis by step at the time of initial recruitment. Each grade was divided into three bands, step 1, steps 2 to 5 and steps 6 and above, and the percentage recruited in each band calculated. After taking into account a deviation of plus or minus 5 per cent, the data showed the most pronounced differences at the P-5 level, with the staff from the African, Eastern European, Middle Eastern and North American and Caribbean regions being recruited at steps higher than step 1 within a particular grade. This information is presented in annex III.

25. The Office of Internal Oversight Services also analysed the proportion of grades at the Professional and Director levels within all initial appointments by gender, as shown in table 5. For example, while 8.5 per cent of all initial appointments occurred at the P-4 level, 11.2 per cent of all male appointments were at the P-4 level and 4.6 per cent of all female appointments were at the P-4 level. This analysis showed consistently lower than average proportions for initial appointments for females at the P-3 level and above. This data is illustrated below in table 5.

Table 5
Initial appointment to grades by gender, 1996-2001

	Overall 11,459	*Male 6,771*	*Female 4,688*
Grade	*Percentage*		
D-2	.67	.90	.34
D-1	1.4	1.9	.70
P-5	2.7	3.8	1.2
P-4	8.5	11.2	4.6
P-3	11.8	13.6	9.2
P-2	10.9	9.7	12.5
P-1	1.4	.96	2.1

26. A similar analysis was done for promotions of staff by breaking down the data by region and gender, as shown in table 6.

Table 6

Promotions by region and gender, 1996-2001	
Total promotions: 4,738 (4,484 individuals) (percentage)	
Western Europe	26
North America and the Caribbean	23
Asia and the Pacific	20
Africa	13
Latin America	9
Eastern Europe	4
Middle East	4
Others	1
Male 49	
Female 51	

27. In the analysis of the promotion by grades and region, the predominant pattern indicates that staff from the North American and Caribbean region had below-average promotions in the P-3 to D-2 range. Other notable patterns showed that staff from the African region showed a higher-than-average promotion rate at the D-2 and P-5 levels and staff from the Middle Eastern region showed a higher-than-average promotion rate at the D-1 and P-5 levels. The deviation was again plus or minus 0.5 per cent. A table showing the full range of promotions by grade within each region can be found in annex IV.

28. The analysis of promotions at different steps by region indicated more consistent deviation from the average at all levels reviewed (P-3, P-4 and P-5) and for all regions, than that found for initial appointments. The data indicates that most promotions occur to steps higher than step 1. Promotions to higher steps could indicate that the staff receiving these promotions had been at their prior grade for extended periods. The table illustrating the analysis of promotions at different steps by region can be found in annex V.

29. The promotion by gender at the Professional and Director levels is found in table 7. While proportions are again smaller for females at all levels, most notable is the significant difference between males promoted to the D-2 level versus females promoted to the same level.

Table 7
Promotion to grades by gender, 1996-2001 (percentage)

Grade	*Overall 4,738*	*Male 2,343*	*Female 2,395*
D-2	1.1	1.9	.33
D-1	3	3.7	2.4
P-5	7.7	9.4	5.9
P-4	11.9	13.2	10.6
P-3	9.7	9.7	9.8
P-2	1.4	1.6	1.3

30. The breakdown of reappointments by region and gender is shown in table 8.

Table 8

Reappointments by region and gender, 1996-2001	
Total reappointments: 15,967 (6,028 individuals) (percentage)	
Western Europe	38
Africa	19
North America and the Caribbean	15
Asia and the Pacific	9
Latin America	8
Eastern Europe	6
Others	3
Middle East	2
Male 52	
Female 48	

31. For the category of reappointments, taking into account the deviation of 0.5 per cent, the data indicates that staff from the Middle Eastern region were reappointed below the average rate in the P-4 to D-2 range. A table showing the full range of reappointments by grade for each region can be found in annex VI.

32. No analysis by step was done for the reappointment category.

33. The proportion of reappointments of males and females is found in table 9. Smaller proportions of reappointments are shown for females from the P-3 to D-2 levels. The level that demonstrates the largest difference between male and female reappointments is P-4, where the proportion of females reappointed is 1.9 per cent and the proportion of males reappointed is 6.7 per cent.

Table 9
Reappointments to grades by gender, 1996-2001 (percentage)

Grade	*Overall 15,967*	*Male 8,325*	*Female 7,642*
D-2	.14	.28	0
D-1	.34	.56	.10
P-5	1.1	1.8	.43
P-4	4.4	6.7	1.9
P-3	7.6	8.7	6.3
P-2	6.8	6	7.7
P-1	.59	.36	.84

34. In order to obtain a picture of how individual staff members progressed during the time period under review, all 718 individuals initially appointed in 1996 were selected.

35. The rates of promotion and reappointment were established by using the number of appointments in each region as the base. Promotion and reappointment rates were also established by gender within each region using the same procedure.

36. As seen in table 10, rates range from 1.7 to 10.6 per cent for promotion and from 17 to 38.3 per cent for reappointment. There are three regions above the overall rates and four regions below. Overall, the promotion rate was lower for females than for males. Regions that had overall promotion rates above the average tended to have promotion rates that were closer between males and females than those regions where the promotion rate was below the overall point. Reappointment rates for males and females varied greatly among regions; however, female reappointment rates were consistently lower for all regions.

Table 10

Promotion and reappointment rates over the period 1996-2001 for individuals hired in 1996, by region and gender

Region	*No. of appointments*	*Promotion rate*	*Reappointment rate*
		Percentage	
Asia and the Pacific	94	10.6	38.3
Male	76	5.3	34.1
Female	18	5.3	4.2
North America and the Caribbean	106	8.5	34.0
Male	71	4.7	20.8
Female	35	3.8	13.2
Western Europe	202	7.4	34.6
Male	145	4.4	27.7
Female	57	3.0	7.9
Middle East	40	5.0	10.0
Male	28	5.0	7.5
Female	12	0.0	2.5
Africa	140	4.3	27.8
Male	99	2.9	22.1
Female	41	1.4	5.7
Latin America	77	3.9	22.1
Male	42	2.6	13.0
Female	35	1.3	9.1
Eastern Europe	59	1.7	17.0
Male	34	1.7	10.2
Female	25	0.0	6.8
Overall	**718**	**6.4**	**29.5**
Male	**495**	**3.9**	**22.0**
Female	**223**	**2.5**	**7.5**

37. An analysis also done of initial appointments, promotions and reappointments by location indicated a greater mix of regions represented at Headquarters and among mission appointees. At the duty stations away from Headquarters (Geneva, Vienna and Nairobi) and the regional commissions, there tends to be more representation from that geographic location. This situation is particularly evident in the regional commissions. A complete analysis of initial appointments, promotions and reappointments at different locations by region is found in annex VII.

38. To analyse possible discrimination based on the language of staff members, the Office of Internal Oversight Services anticipated using data from IMIS on the mother tongue of staff, correlating it to data on region and gender already presented in the present report. However, out of 14,905 staff in IMIS with appointments of one year or more, only 1,200 records indicated a staff members' mother tongue, making

any analysis or correlation based on such limited information impossible. Executive offices should undertake a project to record in IMIS the mother tongue of their staff members.

39. The Joint Inspection Unit is undertaking a study on multilingualism as part of its work programme. The Office of Internal Oversight Services contacted the inspectors undertaking the study to ensure that there would be synergy and no duplication in the work of the two oversight units in this area. The inspectors prepared a detailed questionnaire that was sent to all Joint Inspection Unit participating organizations, and which included a comprehensive section on human resources management, from which the Office of Internal Oversight Services planned to draw information. However, at the time of the preparation of the report, responses to the questionnaire had not addressed the section on Human Resources Management in a comprehensive manner. The Office of Internal Oversight Services informed the Joint Inspection Unit of the limitations on the work undertaken on possible discrimination based on language and it is anticipated that the report of the Unit will shed more light on the subject.

40. As previously noted in paragraph 22, the Office of Human Resources Management is in the process of developing Galaxy, a web-based tool to support the new staff selection system in the Secretariat. The system will extract key job requirements, including language proficiency requirements, from generic job profiles and vacancy announcements. It is expected that Galaxy will ensure that recruitment and promotion criteria are consistently applied. The Galaxy project will be discussed in more detail in the review of the control environment in place to support the recruitment, placement and promotion process.

4. General Service to Professional and national competitive examinations

41. The Office of Internal Oversight Services reviewed data supplied by the Examination and Tests Section of the Office of Human Resources Management for candidates who were convoked to the oral examination in the "G to P" examination process and compared it to data on those staff who were successful in passing the test. An average success rate of 41.4 per cent was established for all regions varying from 20 to 58 per cent. Three regions had success rates below average (North America and the Caribbean, 41 per cent, Latin America, 30 per cent and Middle East, 20 per cent). Four regions had success rates above the average (Western Europe, 58 per cent, Eastern Europe, 50 per cent, Asia and the Pacific, 49 per cent and Africa, 42 per cent). Men had a higher success rate than women (53.5 and 40.7 per cent, respectively).

42. The Office of Internal Oversight Services reviewed the data for those staff members who were recruited through the national competitive examination process from January 2000 to October 2001. Staff recruited through the process are subject to the system of desirable ranges. During this time period, 130 staff members were recruited. The largest percentage of staff recruited (53 per cent) were from the Western European region, this being consistent with the region's status as having no over-represented country within it. Of the 130 staff recruited, none was from the Middle Eastern region. According to the Office of Human Resources Management, the examination was offered in 1999 and 2000 in all unrepresented and underrepresented countries in the Middle East, but either the offer was not accepted by the Member State or no candidate applied to take the examination in that region.

In 2001, the examination was offered for one unrepresented country, but the sole applicant did not appear to take the test. In the same year, the examination was offered for one underrepresented country. In that instance, three applicants were convoked to the examination, but only one sat it. That individual was successfully placed in November 2001, outside the period of analysis.

5. The International Tribunals

43. At the International Tribunal for Rwanda, from January 2000 to September 2001, approximately 107 staff members were recruited at or promoted to the Professional level and above through the appointment and promotion bodies. During that period, individuals from the African region accounted for approximately 51 per cent of those recruited or promoted at all levels, with the exception of the D-1 level, where there were none. There was also significant representation from the Western European and North American and Caribbean regions among recruitments and promotions. In this same group, recruitments from the African region accounted for 47.7 per cent of all those recruited, while 62 per cent of those promoted were from the African region, although there were none at the P-5 or D-1 levels. Females accounted for 26 per cent of the recruitments and promotions, while males accounted for 74 per cent.

44. From 1997 to October 2001, there were approximately 699 recruitments and promotions at the International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia for posts in the Professional and higher categories. Of all the staff recruited or promoted at the Professional level and above, the largest number, 41 per cent were from the Western European region. The highest per cent recruited or promoted at each level ranged from 34.7 to 50 per cent for the Western European region with significant representation from three other regions (Eastern Europe, Asia and the Pacific and North America and the Caribbean). Females accounted for 36.6 per cent of all recruitments and promotions, while males accounted for 63.4 per cent.

45. It should be noted that there was no attempt made to compare the representation by region or gender at the two Tribunals, particularly as the data furnished covered different time periods. However, the pattern of the regional data presented for both Tribunals is similar to the data presented in the analysis by location found in paragraph 38 and annex VI. The data indicates that the staff population to a large extent reflects the geographic location of the organizational entity. The data on gender suggests that there is significant disparity at the Professional level and above between males and females recruited and promoted in the Tribunals, with men outnumbering women by almost three to one in the International Tribunal for Rwanda and two to one in the International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

B. Control environment

46. An examination of the controls and procedures in place in the Organization is critical to determining whether recruitment, placement and promotion activities are likely to produce fair and objective selection of candidates, based on experience and qualifications and free of bias.

1. Recruitment, placement and promotion process

47. The Organization is currently moving forward with a process of reform that includes a new staffing system to integrate recruitment, placement, managed mobility and promotion. The Office of Internal Oversight Services examined both the policies and procedures currently in place and those that are scheduled for implementation in mid-2002.

48. With regard to the existing system, for recruitment, placement and promotion, the Office of Internal Oversight Services prepared a flow chart on the process and identified key control points. Views were sought from staff associated with the recruitment, placement and promotion process on the effectiveness of the controls. The majority of those responding indicated a loss of confidence with the first step in the process, the preparation of the job description and vacancy announcement. The most frequent comments noted that, in many cases, job descriptions were tailor-made for a pre-selected candidate. Comments also reflected an overwhelming loss of confidence in the vacancy announcement process for a number of reasons. First, even in cases where the job description has been prepared in an objective manner, it does not always form the basis for the vacancy announcement. Second, external vacancy announcements sometimes require a candidate to have knowledge of the United Nations system. Third, despite the involvement of the Office of Human Resources Management in the preparation and classification of the job description and the preparation of the vacancy announcement, several respondents expressed the view that in the end, the arguments presented by the department or office were generally accepted. The next step in the process, circulation of the vacancy announcement, also led to the identification of some perceived problems. These include waiving the issuance of vacancy announcements and having limited circulation (related to either time or location) of vacancy announcements.

49. The Office of Internal Oversight Services analysed data from information circulars on promotion and placement for the period 1998-2001 on waivers of vacancy announcements. The majority of these waivers (70 per cent) occurred at the General Service level, with 82 per cent of the waivers resulting in the placement or promotion of women. Of the 30 per cent of waivers occurring at the Professional and Director levels, only 33 per cent resulted in the placement or promotion of women. During the same period, over 72.5 per cent of all waivers issued to vacancy announcements at all levels resulted in the placement or promotion of staff from three regions, Asia and the Pacific, Western Europe and North America and the Caribbean.

50. The next step in the process involves the selection of candidates' applications forwarded to the departments or offices. Applications are reviewed to determine whether the applicants meet some or all of the qualifications of the post. This point in the process involves some subjectivity on the part of the person reviewing the application and some respondents expressed concern that the selection criteria might not be strictly in accordance with the stated qualifications of the post and, in most cases, are not subject to a second review. There are occasions when the affected department or office requests the applications of all applicants for review.

51. When the applicants are reviewed at the departmental or office level, there is also room for subjectivity. Sometimes managers are faced with the daunting task of reducing hundreds of applicants to only a few. The means for achieving this goal are not always transparent, well documented or consistent. Respondents expressed most

confidence in the review process by appointment and promotion bodies. Several instances were pointed out when the competent appointment or promotion body overturned the recommendation of the manager.

52. An area of concern identified by staff within the Organization, as well as by human resources experts, is the role that performance appraisal plays in the selection process. The Office of Internal Oversight Services attempted to use information from the IMIS database on performance appraisal in conjunction with the analysis of promotion data. Out of 14,905 staff on the database with appointments of one year or more, only 3,254 had corresponding data on performance evaluation. The data found for these staff contained a mix of information from the old Performance Evaluation Report (PER) and the new Performance Appraisal System (PAS) and information on both was recorded inconsistently. IMIS was designed to accommodate the PER system and does not provide a dedicated user session for PAS. A workaround was developed using the PER user session. In a memorandum to heads of departments and executive officers of 9 July 1997, the then Assistant Secretary-General for Human Resources advised them of their responsibility for recording PAS data in IMIS. On 20 March 2002, in administrative instruction ST/AI/2002/3 on the PAS, it was noted that the relevant Executive or Personnel Office was responsible for ensuring that PAS records appear in IMIS. Manual data maintained by departments or offices and sent to the Office of Human Resources Management is kept at the aggregate level and not categorized by gender, level or nationality and is therefore not useful for analytical purposes. It is noted that enhancements are being implemented to the PAS in 2002 and the importance of keeping complete electronic data on the IMIS system for each individual for the purpose of future analysis is stressed.

53. As mentioned previously, the Organization is in the process of implementing a new staff selection system. The Office of Internal Oversight Services examined the planned systems and procedures and found that many of the aforementioned concerns with the existing process will be addressed. The new staff selection system will be reinforced by Galaxy among other things. Generic job profiles will be developed and stored in the system. From these job profiles, vacancy announcements will be generated and posted worldwide, using web-based technology. The software will provide the means to collect applications and do preliminary screening of applicants. It will facilitate decision-making without cumbersome paper documentation. Central review bodies will replace the appointment and promotion bodies. It should be noted that reliance on any software system brings with it a requirement for proper control of that system including audit trails, access security, limited ability to override system controls and a tightly controlled maintenance operation. These and other issues will be the subject of a review of the implementation of human resources reform being undertaken by the Office of Internal Oversight Services mandated by the General Assembly in resolution 56/253 of 24 December 2001.

2. Accountability of managers

54. One of the stated goals of the new staff selection system is to hold managers accountable for their selection, decisions and the manner in which they have applied the new system. Since 1999, the Office of Human Resources Management, departments and offices have been jointly developing human resources action plans that lay out the proposed action to be taken to meet their staffing requirements with

regard to gender, age and geographical representation, among other factors. Plans for two periods have been developed thus far. The Office of Internal Oversight Services reviewed Phase 1 plans, covering 1999 and 2000. Out of 26 departments and offices, 20 plans had been signed. For Phase 2, plans had been signed for 13 departments and offices as at 10 January 2002 (a further 12 were in the final stages of preparation, but not available to the Office of Internal Oversight Services). The Office of Human Resources Management has advised that 19 have been signed as at 15 April 2002. However, several other organizational entities are profiled in the reports of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat and on the improvement in the status of women. Human resources action plans should be prepared to cover these entities as well. The plans provide a management tool to draw attention to and address areas of possible discrimination by identifying the promotion and recruitment actions needed in the light of existing and foreseeable vacancies.

55. As a management tool to prevent or redress discriminatory practices, the plans need to be strengthened to fulfil certain criteria. The plans for each department need to be prepared at regular intervals. Agreed actions need to be aggressive, relevant and, where possible, measurable (i.e. numerically). Text should be customized for the situation in each department or office. Linkage between the various categories should be observed, for example, gender targets or filling of posts from unrepresented or underrepresented countries should be specifically linked to vacant posts or those becoming vacant through known retirements.

56. While in the early stages of development, the human resources action plans could become a useful tool to hold managers accountable for their recruitment and promotion actions by showing progress towards and/or achievement of the targets set in prior plans. To be comparable throughout the Secretariat, consistency of information is critical. Close monitoring at the highest level of management should be undertaken by the Office of Human Resources Management to ensure accountability.

C. Complaint mechanisms

57. An important aspect of the control environment is the framework in place to handle complaints of alleged discrimination. The Office of Internal Oversight Services reviewed the framework in place in the Organization, as well as those frameworks that exist in other selected international organizations and national Governments. At the United Nations, the framework for handling complaints of discrimination comprises the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances, the Joint Appeals Board and the United Nations Administrative Tribunal.

1. Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances

58. Within the United Nations, the General Assembly, in its resolution 31/26, established a panel to investigate allegations of discriminatory treatment and to recommend appropriate action. Accordingly, pursuant to administrative instructions ST/AI/246 of 28 July 1977 and ST/AI/246/Add.1 of 19 June 1978 panels were established to investigate allegations of discriminatory treatment in the United Nations Secretariat at Headquarters and at major duty stations away from

Headquarters. By ST/AI/308/Rev.1 of 25 November 1983, the Secretary-General broadened the terms of reference of the panels to cover all types of staff grievances.

59. A review of the terms of membership of the Panel indicated that there were several lengthy periods of up to three years when the terms of members had expired. The terms were not extended nor were new members appointed. The terms of reference for the Panel included the provision of an annual report summarizing the activities of the Panels at Headquarters and other duty stations. The report was produced for several years at a time and there were a few gaps between reports. Table 11 provides information on the terms of Panel members and reporting periods.

Table 11
Terms of membership and reporting periods of the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances

Constitution of Panel	*Expiry of mandate*	*No established Panel*	*Period of report*
15 October 1984[a]	No date of expiry		
4 February 1985-2 June 1985 (Panel members were the same as in previous composition)			
3 June 1985	2 June 1987		
2 April 1987 (new members added due to resignation of Panel members)	2 June 1987		4 February 1985 to 30 April 1988[a]
		3 June 1987-15 July 1990	1 May 1988 to 30 January 1990
16 July 1990	15 June 1991		1 February 1990 to 30 June 1991
		16 June 1991-17 May 1992	1 July 1991 to 30 June 1992
18 May 1992	17 April 1994		1 July 1993 to 30 March 1997
		18 April 1994-23 October 1997	
24 October 1997	23 September 1999		19 November 1997 to 31 December 1998
		24 September 1999-To date	

[a] Documentation prior to these dates was not available.

60. As a result of the interview process and our review of documentation, several weaknesses became apparent in the functioning of the Panel. The purpose of the Panel is to provide a facility to resolve differences between staff and management without going through formal recourse procedures. Over the years, staff have become disillusioned with the ability of the Panel to function due to the number of backlogged cases, lack of attention by management and weak follow-up on the recommendations of the Panel. The Office of Internal Oversight Services also noted difficulties in the complaint resolution process at duty stations away from Headquarters when Panel members are not stationed there. Every individual interviewed expressed the view that if cases were dealt with in the early stages, and serious attention given by management of both the department involved and the Office of Human Resources Management, many of these cases would not reach the point of formal recourse procedures.

61. There has been no Panel in place since September 1999 and no report on the activities of the Panel since 31 December 1998. Even though information circular ST/IC/2001/99 announced the appointment of a new Panel, there has been no mention of the Co-coordinator to be appointed by the Secretary-General. The information circular also indicated that the Panel was to be replaced by the ombudsman mechanism that was subsequently approved by the General Assembly in its resolution 56/253. Given the wide geographic area and the number of cases with which prior Panels have been seized, the Office of Internal Oversight Services is of the view that a similar support mechanism will be required by the Ombudsman. With the introduction of a completely new recruitment, placement and promotion system for the Organization as described in section V.B above, many of the traditional checks and balances are being eliminated. The Office of Internal Oversight Services is of the view that the Ombudsman's office should serve as the first stop for a staff member when problems are encountered that cannot be resolved at the departmental level. The proposed terms of reference of the Ombudsman as presented in annex II of the report of the Secretary-General on the administration of justice in the Secretariat (A/56/800) should be revised to require all cases of alleged discrimination to be submitted for informal recourse procedures before going on to formal remedies. Of paramount importance is that both the Ombudsman and the support system be viewed as having complete independence in the conduct of their work.

62. The Office of Internal Oversight Services analysed the reports of the Panels at Headquarters and other duty stations and noted that the majority of cases (335) were captured under the category of "unfair treatment/personal relations", with only 41 categorized as discrimination based on either nationality, race or sex.

2. United Nations Administrative Tribunal

63. The Office of Internal Oversight Services reviewed a sample of 20 judgements rendered by the United Nations Administrative Tribunal. Over 1,000 judgements have been rendered to date by the Tribunal with more than 130 containing the word "discrimination" in the text. For the sample, the Office of Internal Oversight Services selected those judgements where the word was used most frequently. Some of those cases had also been reviewed by the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances and the Joint Appeals Board.

64. Of the twenty cases reviewed, 15 pertained to male appellants and five to female appellants. Eight applicants alleged nationality-based discrimination while three alleged gender-based discrimination. One applicant alleged that he had been discriminated against for his role in staff union activities. Eight of the applicants did not specify the basis for the alleged discrimination (table 12).

Table 12
Alleged discrimination by gender of appellants and basis, considered by the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances, the Joint Appeals Board and the United Nations Administrative Tribunal

Total number of alleged discrimination cases	*Number of male applicants*	*Number of female applicants*	*Alleged discrimination based on national origin*	*Alleged discrimination based on gender*	*Alleged discrimination based on Staff Union-related activities*	*Alleged discrimination for which no basis was identified*
20	15	5	8	3	1	8

a. Decisions of the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances

65. The Panel considered 14 of the 20 cases reviewed. The Panel ruled in favour of the applicants in all 14 cases, finding evidence of discrimination in 3 cases (table 13). The Panel was clear and precise in describing these cases as "discrimination cases". In commenting on one case, the Panel stated that the applicants had been subject to "prejudicial treatment on the part of the Administration", "unequal treatment", "harassment" and "discrimination". In another case, in calling upon the Administration for remedy, the Panel requested that the Administration investigate and properly deal with the "very subtle form of discrimination", which seemed to have prevailed in the applicant's department.

Table 13
Selected sample of cases submitted to the United Nations Administrative Tribunal: determination of cases by the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances, the Joint Appeals Board and the United Nations Administrative Tribunal

Judicial body	*Total number of cases considered*	*Discrimination cases*	*Non-compliance cases*	*Cases with no merit*	*Compensation recommended*
Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances	14	3	11	0	-
Joint Appeals Board	16	1	7	8	6
United Nations Administrative Tribunal	20	0	17	3	14

66. The Panel found evidence of irregularities including non-compliance with rules, regulations and procedures in eleven cases. The Panel recommended remedial action in all 14 cases considered. However, in 12 out of 14 cases the recommendations were not accepted by management. All 14 cases went on to the Joint Appeals Board.

b. Decisions of the Joint Appeals Board

67. The Joint Appeals Board considered 16 of the sampled cases. The Board ruled in favour of the applicants in eight cases, including one in which it found evidence of gender-based discrimination. In commenting on the case in which it found evidence of discrimination, the Board stated, "... the denial of her right to be considered for promotion objectively and fairly ... in accordance with established procedures without interference and prejudice, and with due account being taken of the special guidelines relating to the equal treatment of women, amounts to discrimination". This case had not been taken up by the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances.

68. The Joint Appeals Board found evidence of other irregularities that violated the rights of applicants in seven cases. The Board commented on one such case that, "... the procedure employed by the Administration, which led to the decision against renewal, constituted unequal treatment, since it differed from the procedure used in other cases", but declined to make a determination of prejudice. The words "unequal treatment" would appear to constitute discrimination as defined by the various conventions cited in paragraph 7 above. In this case, the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances had considered the case with a finding of discrimination.

c. Decisions of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal

69. The United Nations Administrative Tribunal considered all 20 sampled cases. It ruled in favour of applicants fully or partially in 17 cases. However, it found, no evidence of discrimination in any of the cases, but violations of rules and regulations or procedures, and recommended compensation for the applicants in 14 cases, as table 13 indicates. From the cases reviewed in the sample, it appears that applicants refer cases to the Tribunal even when their case has been given favourable consideration by the Panel or Joint Appeals Board. Lack of resolution of complaints before appeals are sent to the Tribunal results in additional costs to the Organization that could be avoided by requiring informal recourse procedures before proceeding to formal recourse procedures.

70. As demonstrated above, there is an absence of unanimity in the rulings of the Panel, the Joint Appeals Board and the United Nations Administrative Tribunal regarding the presence of discrimination in a given case. In some cases, the word discrimination is not used but the descriptive analysis is very similar to the definition of discrimination as found in various international norms and conventions. The development of criteria for supporting a finding of discrimination would provide a basis for consistency among the complaint mechanisms.

71. Additional oversight work is being done on both the Board and the Tribunal that will provide some recommendations on how these processes can be improved and thereby give more value added to the Organization.

3. Staff Council survey

72. On 6 September 2001, Staff Committee Bulletin No. 1487 was issued in New York. It contained a questionnaire on discrimination and offered staff the opportunity to describe experiences that they considered discriminatory. The bulletin was reissued on 2 November 2001, to ensure that all staff had ample time to respond.

73. The Office of Internal Oversight Services was given permission to review the responses while maintaining strict confidentiality of the respondents. In the 80 responses pertaining to the United Nations Secretariat, the most predominant type of discrimination reported by staff was based on nationality (45). Most respondents indicated that they had experienced more than one type of discrimination. Grade or level was the basis in 30 instances, followed by gender (27), race (25), religion (12), sexual preference (9) and age (9).

74. It was the view of many respondents that the mechanisms to deal with complaints of discrimination in the Organization were inadequate and lacked independence. Several expressed feelings of futility and fear of reprisal and retaliation if they chose to use the complaint mechanisms.

75. The Office of Internal Oversight Services took note of the many concrete and constructive suggestions for curtailing discrimination in the Organization, some of which are in line with the recommendations that will be made later in the present report.

76. During the course of the inspection, several staff members brought forward to the Office of Internal Oversight Services cases that they believed were discriminatory in nature. Although it was not within the scope of the inspection to address individual cases, each case was carefully reviewed to determine whether the circumstances described pointed to procedural problems related to a specific system or location. These problems will be addressed by other upcoming oversight work as appropriate.

77. The Office of Internal Oversight Services also noted that not all the cases described in the staff survey or brought independently to its attention pertained to discrimination in recruitment, placement and promotion. Instances were described of day-to-day experiences in which individuals were the subject of derogatory statements, lack of respect or other behaviour by their peers or supervisors that they considered discriminatory in nature. The Office of Human Resources Management includes training in diversity in its management and supervisory training courses, however, the Office of Internal Oversight Services believes that all staff would benefit from specific training in diversity early in their careers in the Organization.

4. Comparison with other entities

78. In order to learn about best practices and provide a basis for comparison with the complaint mechanisms of the United Nations, the Office of Internal Oversight Services researched the complaint processes of several Member States. The information cited below provides examples that can be found in the public domain on the Internet.

79. In South Africa, the Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration is the main statutory dispute resolution body. If a dispute remains unresolved after conciliation efforts, it can be referred by any of the parties to the Labour Court for adjudication. The Labour Court considers disputes under the Labour Relations Act 1995, including unfair dismissal and the application or interpretation of collective agreements and, like the Commission, also deals with disputes concerning unfair discrimination under the Employment Equity Act 1998. The Act has six significant provisions: unfair discrimination, affirmative action, employment equity plans,

training, reporting by employers and income differentials. It applies to all employers (public and private sectors) and uses gender-neutral language.

80. In India, Boards of Conciliation may be established by the central or state Government and promote the settlement of a particular industrial dispute. In any industrial establishment with 50 or more employees, a Grievance Settlement Authority must be provided for the settlement of industrial disputes with individual employees.

81. In Indonesia, when a dispute concerning employment relations, terms of employment and/or work conditions arises, the trade union and employer must seek to resolve the dispute by negotiation. If this fails, dispute settlement can be channelled through the Board of Arbitration or an Officer of the Minister of Labour. Upon failure to reconcile the differences, the Officer must refer the case to the Regional Committee for a decision. It is possible to appeal a decision to the Central Committee.

82. In the United States of America, the mission of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is to promote equal opportunity in employment through administrative and judicial enforcement of five federal civil rights laws and through education and technical assistance. In the equal employment opportunity complaint process, the first and most important step is the use of alternative dispute resolution or mediation, which is now mandatory before proceeding to the investigative processes. The complaint process consists of three parts: (a) the informal process — counselling; (b) the formal process — a legal procedure; and (c) the appeal process. The statutes enforced by the Commission make it illegal to discriminate against employees or applicants for employment on the basis of race, colour, religion, sex, national origin, disability or age. Further, a person who files a complaint or participates in an investigation of an equal employment opportunity complaint, or who opposes an employment practice made illegal under any of the statutes enforced by the Commission, is protected from retaliation.

83. Time limitations are in place for required action to expedite the complaint process. Employees or applicants who believe that they have been discriminated against by a federal agency have the right to file a complaint with that agency. The first step is to contact an equal employment opportunity counsellor, or request alternative dispute resolution, if offered, at the agency within 45 days of the alleged discriminatory action. Usually, counselling must be completed within 30 days and alternative dispute resolution within 90 days. At the end of counselling, or if alternative dispute resolution is unsuccessful, the individual may then file a complaint with the agency. The agency must conduct an investigation, unless the complaint is dismissed, and when completed, the complainant may request a hearing before an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission administrative judge or an immediate final decision from the agency. In cases where a hearing is requested, the administrative judge issues a decision within 180 days. An appeal process for both complainant and agency is available.

84. The Complaints Resolution Process in New Zealand is part of the Human Rights Commission. It also has a conciliation stage that comes into play after a complaint has been filed and is the preferred first step for quick resolution. If the complaint is within jurisdiction and is accepted, a complaints resolution officer contacts the parties involved. The subsequent investigation provides a report to the Commission, who forms an opinion. This will lead to settlement or referral to the

Complaints Review Tribunal and legislative appeal bodies, as appropriate. All information, including the areas considered unlawful discrimination and an undertaking of treatment, and the necessary complaint forms and guidelines for completion are available on the Internet. In order to promote human rights, the Commission publishes case studies in its newsletter, using completed investigations of specific interest, concealing all identifying details.

85. The Office of Internal Oversight Services also reviewed the conflict resolution systems in two other international organizations, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank. In UNDP, in cases requiring redress against action taken by the supervisor or by the organization or in cases of interpersonal conflict, staff members may consult the Ombudsman Panel, usually within one month of the incident. Staff members may also request an administrative review. If the staff member remains dissatisfied, he or she may refer the case to the Joint Appeals Board. The Ombudsman Panel is composed of two staff members working part time on a voluntary basis. It provides impartial advice and guidance to staff and management on personnel policies and practices. The Panel also offers mediation services when appropriate. In August 2001, a review of the internal justice system recommended that the Ombudsman function be institutionalized and professionalized, with reporting done directly to the Administrator.

86. The Conflict Resolution System in place at the World Bank reflects the recognition by that organization of the reality and importance of managing conflict and that it is a shared responsibility of staff and managers alike. The System is comprised of five neutral and independent offices that provide staff support with specialized services ranging from informal counselling to formal review of concerns. The offices are the Office of the Ombudsman, the Mediation Office, the Business Ethics and Integrity Office, the Appeals Committee Office and the Office of the Administrative Tribunal. All information on the complaints process at the World Bank is available to staff on the World Bank Intranet. The Bank has worked comprehensively on diversity and on issues related to working with respect. A network of anti-harassment advisers has been set up at World Bank headquarters and in country offices and training and information materials have been developed.

87. The World Bank has been tackling the issue of discrimination since the 1970s. In 1991, it organized a task force to study barriers to the advancement of women, which led to the creation of the position of Senior Adviser on Gender Equality and a comprehensive action plan. The Bank also commissioned a further study on this issue in 1998, using external consultants to help ensure independence and expertise in workplace equality issues. The study emphasized the importance of institutional goals, action plans and accountability of managers, regular reviews, showcasing successes and recording best practices.

88. As part of its continuing effort to address concerns of racial discrimination, the President of the World Bank commissioned a study in 1997 to assess the situation and prepare recommendations. As a result, in a public announcement in April 1998, the President stated that the Bank's policy would be one of "zero tolerance" and established the position of Senior Adviser for Racial Equality. The Bank addressed issues such as accurate data, positive and negative incentives, regional constraints, gender, possible retaliation and reluctance to file grievances.

89. The United Nations Secretariat has moved along similar lines in the past six years, as it has appointed a Special Adviser on Gender Issues, who reports directly to the Secretary-General, developed human resources action plans that include gender and geographic targets for each department and reviews and reports regularly on the status of gender equality and geographic distribution in the Secretariat. Under-Secretaries-General have also been tasked with developing compacts that hold them accountable for achieving human resources targets. A post at the level of Assistant Secretary-General level for an Ombudsman and one for a legal officer at the P-4 level were established by the General Assembly in its resolution 56/253. However, additional steps need to be taken to ensure an organizational culture free from discrimination that respects the rights of all staff as outlined in the recommendations in this report.

VI. Conclusions

90. Based on the variety of analyses performed during the inspection on data compiled from various systems and records, there does not appear to have been systematic and consistent preference or exclusion that impaired equal opportunity for any given region in initial appointments, promotions and reappointments over the past six years. However, there are instances where regional differences do exist. For certain grades, in particular locations, appointment, promotion and reappointment rates do vary among regions.

91. While some strides have been made towards achieving gender parity, the process has been very slow, particularly at the higher grades. Men are more likely than women to be hired, promoted and reappointed at the P-4 to D-2 levels. More attention needs to be given to recruiting and promoting women at the higher levels and to counteract the rising separation rate of women from the Organization.

92. The data that is kept by the Organization on individual staff members and the recruitment, placement and promotion process does not facilitate analytical work. While the majority of departments and offices were very cooperative, there was difficulty in obtaining complete and consistent information on staff members in electronic form. There were many instances when gaps in the required information needed to be bridged by cleansing data, creating databases, inserting information and manually looking up missing data. The Office of Internal Oversight Services was not able to come to any conclusions on discrimination based on language because of the lack of data referred to above.

93. The current control environment is perceived by some staff and managers as leaving room for discrimination at several points in the recruitment, placement and promotion process, especially the preparation of job descriptions and vacancy announcements. In addition, the selection criteria used to identify short-listed candidates and final selections appeared to lack transparency. The highest level of confidence was expressed for the work of the appointment and promotion bodies. The new staff selection system to be implemented in mid-2002 addresses many of the problems identified in the current system that point to a less than fair and transparent process. However, the success of the new system depends heavily on the accountability of managers supported by an automated tool that facilitates, but does not replace, the decision-making process.

94. The complaint mechanisms for dealing with problems of discrimination in the Organization need to be strengthened. The one mechanism specifically tasked with handling problems of this nature, the Panel on Discrimination and other Grievances, demonstrated a lack of effectiveness and was dormant for several periods, the most recent, for over two years. While it has also been suggested that the Panel be replaced by the newly created Ombudsman function, the Office of Internal Oversight Services is of the opinion that there is room for the two mechanisms to operate within the Organization in a complementary manner. From the sample of cases submitted to the United Nations Administrative Tribunal that the Office of Internal Oversight Services reviewed, there seemed to be no common ground on findings of discrimination among the complaint mechanisms. The perception of ineffectiveness of the complaint mechanisms results in most cases being appealed to the Tribunal. Based on the review of complaint mechanisms in selected national Governments and other international organizations, it would appear that the Organization would benefit from a comprehensive review of the purpose and structure of the complaint mechanisms, both in terms of staff perception and the cost of administering such mechanisms.

95. Lessons learned from other international organizations indicate that facing the issue of discrimination, even if it is only one of perception, in an open manner, goes a long way towards making the staff feel confident that their problems are being taken seriously by the Administration. A step in this direction would be the articulation of a policy on discrimination promulgated by the Secretary-General in a Secretary-General's bulletin. Specific recommendations for addressing these issues are found in the section VII below.

VII. Recommendations

96. On the basis of the findings and conclusions of this inspection, the Office of Internal Oversight Services makes the following recommendations:

97. The Secretary-General should articulate a policy on discrimination for the Organization in a Secretary-General's Bulletin (SP-01-005-001).*

98. The Office of Human Resources Management should include information on staff in the International Tribunals in the report of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat (SP-01-005-002).

99. In the light of the trends identified in the reports of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat and the improvement in the status of women, further concentrated efforts should be made to achieve gender parity, especially at the higher levels and to determine the cause(s) for the increasing trend of separation of female staff from the Organization. Managers should be held accountable for meeting the gender targets set in their human resources action plans with assistance provided by the Office of Human Resources Management, the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women and the Gender Focal Point in identifying female candidates (SP-01-005-003).

* The symbols in parentheses in the present section refer to an internal code used by the Office of Internal Oversight Services for recording recommendations.

100. The Office of Human Resources Management should ensure that the Galaxy system being developed to replace the current application database (TREX) and to support the new staffing system captures and maintains all data related to the recruitment, placement and promotion process, including:

(a) The nationality and region of all applicants, both internal and external;

(b) The subset of all applicants who are found to meet the requirements of the post and thus subject to consideration by the programme manager;

(c) The final selected candidate for the post (SP-01-005-004).

101. Executive offices should undertake a project to verify and input to IMIS data on the mother tongue of their staff (SP-01-005-005).

102. The Office of Human Resources Management should ensure that the central review bodies that will replace appointment and promotion bodies, both at Headquarters and at offices away from Headquarters, maintain consistent records of their work, including the data elements and format used (SP-01-005-006).

103. The Office of Human Resources Management should ensure that performance appraisal data for each staff member is available in the IMIS system by: (a) requesting an enhancement to the IMIS system to handle properly the performance appraisal data of the PAS system; and (b) reminding programme managers of their responsibility to input performance appraisal information for their staff and keep it current. The Office of Human Resources Management should use this data for reporting purposes and eliminate the need for executive offices to collect manually produced summary data that may not be accurate or consistent (SP-01-005-007).

104. The Office of Human Resources Management should ensure that adequate controls are built into the Galaxy system, including but not limited to: (a) audit trails; (b) security; (c) maintenance of the job descriptions that form the core of the system; and (d) maintenance of the application itself (SP-01-005-008).

105. Heads of departments and offices and programme managers should be held strictly accountable for complying with the rules and procedures of the new staffing system. The Office of Human Resources Management should be responsible for monitoring and reporting on the performance of programme managers in this regard (SP-01-005-009).

106. Departmental human resources action plans should be strengthened to assist the Office of Human Resources Management in monitoring accountability of programme managers by: (a) tailoring the plan to the specific situation in the department or office; (b) setting aggressive and measurable targets; (c) using a format that facilitates comparison of actual results to the plan; and (d) ensuring that all organizational entities prepare human resources action plans (SP-01-005-010).

107. An evaluation of the complaint mechanisms for addressing cases of alleged discrimination should be undertaken with a view to strengthening them by:

(a) Providing an adequate support system to ensure that informal recourse procedures and access to the Ombudsman are available to staff at all duty stations;

(b) Revising the proposed terms of reference of the Ombudsman to require all cases of alleged discrimination be subject to informal recourse procedures through the Ombudsman before they can proceed to the Joint Appeals Board;

(c) Developing criteria for supporting a finding of discrimination by the various complaint mechanisms;

(d) Ensuring the independence of the complaint mechanisms within the reporting structure of the Organization (SP-01-005-011).

108. Specific diversity training courses should be included by the Office of Human Resources Management in its training programme and be required for all staff members when they enter the Organization (SP-01-005-012).

Management has responded that this is a worthy recommendation but that it is not possible without additional resources.

(*Signed*) Dileep **Nair**
Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services

Notes

[1] Documents A/52/580, A/53/375, A/54/279 and Corr.1, A/55/427, A/56/512 and Corr.1.

[2] Documents A/52/408, A/53/376, A/54/405, A/55/399 and Corr.1, A/56/472.

[3] Staff of the International Criminal Tribunals are not included in the report of the Secretary-General on the composition of the Secretariat.

[4] The data in IMIS was presumed to be accurate and complete for the purpose of analysis.

[5] Reappointment is when a staff member who has formally separated from the Organization is brought back into it; it does not include regular extension of appointment.

Annex I

Countries within regions

Africa

1. Algeria
2. Angola
3. Benin
4. Botswana
5. Burkina Faso
6. Burundi
7. Cameroon
8. Cape Verde
9. Central African Republic
10. Chad
11. Comoros
12. Congo
13. Côte d'Ivoire
14. Democratic Republic of the Congo
15. Djibouti
16. Egypt
17. Equatorial Guinea
18. Eritrea
19. Ethiopia
20. Gabon
21. Gambia
22. Ghana
23. Guinea
24. Guinea-Bissau
25. Kenya
26. Lesotho
27. Liberia
28. Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
29. Madagascar
30. Malawi
31. Mali
32. Mauritania
33. Mauritius
34. Morocco
35. Mozambique
36. Namibia
37. Niger
38. Nigeria
39. Rwanda
40. Sao Tome and Principe
41. Senegal
42. Seychelles
43. Sierra Leone
44. Somalia
45. South Africa
46. Sudan
47. Swaziland
48. Togo
49. Tunisia
50. Uganda
51. United Republic of Tanzania
52. Zambia
53. Zimbabwe

Asia and the Pacific

1. Australia
2. Bangladesh
3. Bhutan
4. Brunei Darussalam
5. Cambodia
6. China
7. Democratic People's Republic of Korea
8. Fiji
9. India
10. Indonesia
11. Japan
12. Kiribati
13. Lao People's Democratic Republic
14. Malaysia
15. Maldives
16. Marshall Islands
17. Micronesia (Federated States of)
18. Mongolia
19. Myanmar
20. Nauru
21. Nepal
22. New Zealand
23. Pakistan
24. Palau
25. Papua New Guinea
26. Philippines
27. Republic of Korea
28. Samoa
29. Singapore
30. Solomon Islands
31. Sri Lanka
32. Thailand
33. Tonga
34. Tuvalu
35. Vanuatu
36. Viet Nam

Europe (Eastern)

1. Albania
2. Armenia
3. Azerbaijan
4. Belarus
5. Bosnia and Herzegovina
6. Bulgaria
7. Croatia
8. Czech Republic
9. Estonia
10. Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
11. Georgia
12. Hungary
13. Kazakhstan
14. Kyrgyzstan
15. Latvia
16. Lithuania
17. Poland
18. Republic of Moldova
19. Romania
20. Russian Federation
21. Slovakia
22. Slovenia
23. Tajikistan
24. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
25. Turkmenistan
26. Ukraine
27. Uzbekistan

Europe (Western)

1. Andorra
2. Austria
3. Belgium
4. Denmark
5. Finland
6. France
7. Germany
8. Greece
9. Iceland
10. Ireland
11. Italy
12. Liechtenstein
13. Luxembourg
14. Malta
15. Monaco
16. Netherlands
17. Norway
18. Portugal
19. San Marino
20. Spain
21. Sweden
22. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Latin America

1. Argentina
2. Bolivia
3. Brazil
4. Chile
5. Colombia
6. Costa Rica
7. Cuba
8. Dominican Republic
9. Ecuador
10. El Salvador
11. Guatemala
12. Haiti
13. Honduras
14. Mexico
15. Nicaragua
16. Panama
17. Paraguay
18. Peru
19. Suriname
20. Uruguay
21. Venezuela

Middle East

1. Afghanistan
2. Bahrain
3. Cyprus
4. Iran (Islamic Republic of)
5. Iraq
6. Israel
7. Jordan
8. Kuwait
9. Lebanon
10. Oman
11. Qatar
12. Saudi Arabia
13. Syrian Arab Republic
14. Turkey
15. United Arab Emirates
16. Yemen

North America and the Caribbean

1. Antigua and Barbuda
2. Bahamas
3. Barbados
4. Belize
5. Canada
6. Dominica
7. Grenada
8. Guyana
9. Jamaica
10. Saint Lucia
11. Saint Kitts and Nevis
12. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
13. Trinidad and Tobago
14. United States of America

Others

1. Gibraltar
2. Macao
3. Martinique
4. Palestine
5. Portuguese Territories
6. Stateless
7. Switzerland

Annex II

Initial appointments by grade and region, 1996-2001 (in percentages)

Grade	*Overall 11,459*	*Africa 2,054*	*Asia and the Pacific 1,683*	*Europe (Eastern) 822*	*Europe (Western) 3,334*	*Latin America 1,066*	*Middle East 664*	*North America and the Caribbean 1,962*
USG	**0.37**	0.39	0.53	0.36	0.48	0.09	0	0.30
ASG	**0.33**	0	0.71	0.49	0.45	0	0	0.42
D-2	**0.67**	0.68	1	0.49	0.63	0.47	0.15	0.78
D-1	**1.4**	1	1.8	0.97	2	0.66	0.75	1.4
P-5	**2.7**	2.0	3.6	1.6	3.4	2.8	0.60	2.6
P-4	**8.5**	8.5	11.5	8.9	8.3	6.4	3.6	9.6
P-3	**11.8**	10.8	15	11.2	11.7	10.6	6	13.9
P-2	**10.9**	7.1	12.5	11.1	13.4	8.3	4.7	13.3
P-1	**1.4**	0.78	1.4	2.4	2.1	0.94	0.15	1.5
G-7	**0.55**	1.2	0.47	0.12	0.12	0.37	1	0.78
G-6	**1.6**	2.7	0.83	0.97	0.84	2	2.7	1.9
G-5	**3.8**	5.6	1.8	2.3	2.2	5.6	12.9	2.6
G-4	**7.8**	8.8	5.9	7.2	5.4	12.3	22	4.2
G-3	**12.6**	14.1	12.7	9	9.3	15	18.4	13.9
G-2	**6.1**	10.1	2.4	3.9	5.3	8.4	14	2.4
G-1	**3.7**	3	1.8	12.3	3	3.2	2.9	4.4
FS-5	**0.78**	0.39	0.65	0.73	1.2	0.28	0.30	1.1
FS-4	**2.7**	2.9	3.9	2.3	2.8	1.5	0.45	3.1
FS-3	**5.2**	6.9	7.7	6	4.4	2.2	0.25	5.1
FS-2	**2.4**	2.8	2.8	7.2	1.2	2.1	1.5	1.8
FS-1	**0.18**	0.34	0.24	0.36	0.15	0	0.30	0

Source: Six-year database from the Office of Human Resources Management (all actions United Nations-wide).

Annex III

Initial appointments at different steps by region, 1996-2001 (in percentages)

P-5	Overall 312	Africa 42	Asia and the Pacific 61	Europe (Eastern) 13	Europe (Western) 114	Latin America 30	Middle East 4	North America and the Caribbean 44
Step 1	64	57	72	61	72	63	50	43
Steps 2-5	23	38	21	31	14	24	50	30
Steps 6 and above	13	5	7	8	14	13	0	27

P-4	Overall 976	Africa 175	Asia and the Pacific 194	Europe (Eastern) 73	Europe (Western) 277	Latin America 68	Middle East 24	North America and the Caribbean 160
Step 1	80	83	78	81	81	85	67	77
Steps 2-5	9	9	9	9	8	3	8	10
Steps 6 and above	11	8	13	9	11	12	25	13

P-3	Overall 1 353	Africa 222	Asia and the Pacific 252	Europe (Eastern) 92	Europe (Western) 391	Latin America 113	Middle East 40	North America and the Caribbean 232
Step 1	77	77	81	81	73	81	80	75
Steps 2-5	13	12	11	9	16	12	13	14
Steps 6 and above	10	11	8	10	11	7	7	11

Source: Six-year database from the Office of Human Resources Management (all actions United Nations-wide).

Annex IV

Promotions by grade and regions, 1996-2001 (in percentages)

Grade	*Overall 4 738*	*Africa 600*	*Asia and the Pacific 938*	*Europe (Eastern) 213*	*Europe (Western) 1 213*	*Latin America 441*	*Middle East 194*	*North America and the Caribbean 1,085*
ASG	3*	2*	0	0	0	0	0	1*
D-2	1.1	3.3	0.75	0.94	1.2	0.91	0.51	0.55
D-1	3.1	2.8	2.4	2.8	3	4.1	6.2	2.6
P-5	7.7	8.3	5.1	16.9	8.2	7.5	11.3	6.5
P-4	11.9	11.2	12.8	25.3	12.6	9.7	10.8	9.7
P-3	9.7	9.2	12.8	14.5	10.5	10.6	6.7	6.2
P-2	1.4	1.5	2.4	0.94	0.66	1.1	2.6	1.6
G-7	4.5	3.7	4.0	2.3	4.4	7.7	4.1	4.2
G-6	11.3	9.8	12.3	6.6	11	11.8	19.6	9.8
G-5	18.9	19.7	22.3	11.7	16.6	21.5	16.5	18.4
G-4	12.5	9.7	12.7	8.4	13.5	11.6	15.5	13.6
G-3	3.9	6.5	3.4	4.2	3.9	3.2	3.1	3.5
G-2	1.1	2.2	0.43	0.47	0.66	0.91	0	1.8
FS-7	0.17	0.17	0	0	0.33	0	0	0.28
FS-6	0.61	1	0.64	0	0.74	0.45	0	0.55
FS-5	1.5	1.8	1.3	0	2	1.1	0	1.8
FS-4	1.8	1.7	1.9	0.47	2.9	0.45	0	2
FS-3	0.60	1	0.85	0	0.91	0	0	0.28

Source: Six-year database from the Office of Human Resources Management (all actions United Nations-wide).

* Raw number.

Annex V

Promotions at different steps by region, 1996-2001 (in percentages)

P-5	*Overall 363*	*Africa 50*	*Asia and the Pacific 48*	*Europe (Eastern) 36*	*Europe (Western) 100*	*Latin America 33*	*Middle East 22*	*North America and the Caribbean 71*
Step 1	**14**	4	19	6	19	12	9	17
Steps 2-5	**38**	34	48	22	32	36	41	49
Steps 6 and above	**48**	62	33	72	49	52	50	34

P-4	*Overall 565*	*Africa 67*	*Asia and the Pacific 120*	*Europe (Eastern) 54*	*Europe (Western) 133*	*Latin America 43*	*Middle East 21*	*North America and the Caribbean 105*
Step 1	**19**	15	18	2	26	16	14	27
Steps 2-5	**44**	36	54	42	43	49	33	39
Steps 6 and above	**37**	49	28	56	31	35	53	34

P-3	*Overall 461*	*Africa 55*	*Asia and the Pacific 120*	*Europe (Eastern) 31*	*Europe (Western) 128*	*Latin America 47*	*Middle East 13*	*North America and the Caribbean 67*
Step 1	**33**	42	40	23	37	19	23	24
Steps 2-5	**51**	51	53	45	47	40	54	66
Steps 6 and above	**16**	7	7	32	16	41	23	10

Source: Six-year database from the Office of Human Resources Management (all actions United Nations-wide).

Annex VI

Reappointment by grade and region, 1996-2001 (in percentages)

Grade	*Overall 15,967*	*Africa 3,076*	*Asia and the Pacific 1,372*	*Europe (Eastern) 975*	*Europe (Western) 6,034*	*Latin America 1,342*	*Middle East 362*	*North America and the Caribbean 2,240*
ASG	**16***	2*	2*	1*	5*	2*	2*	2*
USG	**23***	3*	3*	0	3*	5*	3*	6*
D-2	**0.14**	0.19	0.14	0	0.16	<0.01	0	0.13
D-1	**0.34**	0.39	0.65	0	0.20	0.52	0	0.67
P-5	**1.1**	0.97	1.7	1.7	0.68	1.2	0.55	2.2
P-4	**4.4**	4.2	7.9	4.8	2.6	1.3	3.9	7.5
P-3	**7.6**	6.1	11.4	5	5.7	6.9	8.3	15.3
P-2	**6.8**	5.6	6.4	5	7.2	3	5	12.3
P-1	**0.59**	0.29	0.80	1	0.74	0.22	0	0.53
G-7	**0.39**	0.88	0.22	0.20	0.25	<0.01	0	0.22
G-6	**1**	1.1	1.4	0.41	0.46	1.7	1.1	1.9
G-5	**4.7**	6.9	4.4	2.1	3.3	3.6	6.3	5.2
G-4	**7.5**	6.4	8.2	6.3	7.8	7.4	7.2	6.7
G-3	**12.4**	15.2	13.6	19.4	9.8	15.9	9.1	8.6
G-2	**13.7**	23.1	4.9	9.3	16.2	9.2	6.1	4.8
G-1	**2.8**	6.5	1.8	2.6	1.8	2	1.1	2.5
FS-5	**0.37**	0.45	0.65	0.31	0.25	0.22	0.28	0.67
FS-4	**1.1**	0.94	2.9	0.92	0.74	1.1	3	1.1
FS-3	**1.9**	2.1	4.1	1.5	1	3.1	6.6	1.7
FS-2	**0.62**	0.58	1	1	0.26	0.97	5	0.27

Source: Six-year database from the Office of Human Resources Management (all actions United Nations-wide).
Note: FS-7, FS-6 and FS-1 reappointments were too few for analysis.
* Raw number.

Annex VII

A. Initial appointments at locations buy region, 1996-2001 (in percentages)

Location[a]	*Africa*	*Asia and the Pacific*	*Europe (Eastern)*	*Europe (Western)*	*Latin America*	*Middle East*	*North America and the Caribbean*
Headquarters	12.1	16.2	5.7	29.1	6.3	5.9	23.6
Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Field Administration and Logistics Division	19.4	17	10.7	25.4	8.7	5.2	12.8
Vienna[b]	7.5	10.5	8.7	52.7	5.2	3.5	10.9
Geneva[c]	12.2	12	5.3	45.5	6.1	1.7	11.4
Nairobi[d]	35.1	10	2.9	31	5.7	3.1	11.6
Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia	6.1	1.6	0	4.9	1.2	79	4.5
Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean	0.3	0.3	0	0.5	81.1	0	12.9
Economic Commission for Europe	2.9	9.5	18.1	56.2	2.9	0	5.7
Economic Commission for Africa	92	0.9	2.9	3.7	0.6	0	2.6
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific	1.1	72.3	3.3	14.1	0	0.5	7.6

B. Promotions at locations by region, 1996-2001 (in percentages)

Location[a]	*Africa*	*Asia and the Pacific*	*Europe (Eastern)*	*Europe (Western)*	*Latin America*	*Middle East*	*North America and the Caribbean*
Headquarters	9.4	22.3	4.7	17.8	8.6	2	35
Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Field Administration and Logistics Division	14.3	18.5	0.4	35.2	3.5	1.5	26.3
Vienna[b]	5.6	18.2	5.6	50.7	5.1	4.8	8.6
Geneva[c]	12.1	12.4	5.6	46.4	6.9	4.4	8.5
Nairobi[d]	46	15.1	4	19.1	6	2.3	7
Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia	3.8	7.7	0	4.8	1	73	5.8
Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean	0.7	0	0	8.9	80.1	0.7	8.2
Economic Commission for Europe	1.5	12	21.2	48.5	7.6	3	3
Economic Commission for Africa	93.1	2.7	1.3	1.3	1.3	0	0
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific	0.8	82.2	0.8	10	0	1.6	4.2

C. Reappointments at locations by region, 1996-2001 (in percentages)

Location[a]	*Africa*	*Asia and the Pacific*	*Europe (Eastern)*	*Europe (Western)*	*Latin America*	*Middle East*	*North America and the Caribbean*
Headquarters	12.3	10.6	5.3	30.6	7.6	2.2	30.3
Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Field Administration and Logistics Division	20	16.3	5.3	23.9	9.5	5.2	17.8
Vienna[b]	8.7	9.7	9.2	54.2	3.4	5	8.2
Geneva[c]	10.5	6.6	7.8	54.8	5.4	1.2	6.9
Nairobi[d]	36.3	11.6	3.9	26	11.6	1.2	7.3
Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia	3.5	4.7	0	9.4	1.2	65.9	13
Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean	0	0.6	0	6.7	83.8	0	7.8
Economic Commission for Europe	5.7	8.3	17	44	7	0	12.6
Economic Commission for Africa	98.6	0	0.3	0.6	0	0	0.5
Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific	0	37.3	12	38.8	0	0	6.5

[a] Percentages by location may not add up to 100 per cent, owing to discrepancies in the database for location.

[b] United Nations Office at Vienna, Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention.

[c] United Nations Office at Geneva, Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, United Nations Compensation Commission.

[d] United Nations Office at Nairobi, United Nations Development Programme, UN-Habitat.